ERIC LANDAU: My first name is Eric, E-r-i-c, last name Landau, L-a-n-d-a-u.

I'm a private citizen and I've been a journalist by training. I used to work at the UNR office of hazardous materials for two years as an information specialist and government liaison, and I had the pleasure and some mispleasure of dealing a lot with the DOE and various offices, including the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board and other officials. I found most of the people to be very helpful and somewhat knowledgeable of the activities that are going on in the formation of the Yucca Mountain site.

There was one particular concern that I did wish to address, and one that my colleague, Miss Link, referred to, although not as specifically, and that was in the introduction of the peer review that was just done by an independent group of scientists that was just

35

released on September 4th, and yet I was dismayed to find that the report, if they hadn't had such grievous technical concerns about the suitability of -- site suitability and various other aspects that have been touched on by other people, including casks and the drip

shields in the environmental barrier systems, that this report -- that they had considered just leaving it and only releasing it in February, which I think would have been a grievous error considering the amount of concerns that they have had and that a lot of them specifically time after time in this report have mentioned time after time of inadequateness that they find and questions that don't seem to be getting answered.

One of the things I did want to have mentioned specifically was with the casks themselves and the minerals and the construction -- the materials that are being used to construct them. Many, many questions are being asked, and it doesn't seem that answers are being offered or that they are being delayed.

As Mr. Fulkerson had said earlier, there seems to be -- because right now, as mandated, 2001 is the year that this goes to the President's desk for review and to be signed on, and yet some of these issues have been raised -- I tracked this issue starting back in '93 for many years, and I've actually talked to people

36

who have been out to Paducah, Kentucky where a lot of these casks are that are going to be shipped out here,

12

and a lot of these questions were asked back then and no answers were being offered as to the suitability of them, misunderstandings about the materials, what their suitability is for thresholds.

And only now in this report are they actually being asked, and because the fact this year an answer has to be made, they are saying more years of study are going to be needed, and yet there's been little or no funding to find out the answers to some of these, such as the suitability of that Alloy 22, which is a nickel -- a nickel-iron material that they are considering using for these casks in the long-term storage, and yet it bothers me to note that DOE is using stainless steel 304 as their basis for studying cask materials when that is a completely different material that has -- I don't understand why they are using that as a basis when nickel is a much different material, it has different properties and things of that nature.

Why are they using a stainless steel derivative that's used for automotive exhaust and things of that nature when Alloy 22 is the one actually being considered? I mean, that is a basic -- like I said, I'm not a trained scientist and I don't claim to be, but

3

after talking with people, I find that to be ludicrous and I think worthy of great concern and questions, and yet it has been pretty much exposed in this report that you're going to go forward with this, using this as the main material for the casks that are going to be deposited.

And there have been several concerns about the fact of how well will it stand up if it's -- if it's exposed to air or corrosion, and the fact that the very lattice work of the materials that's used to compose this material has serious structural flaws that they -- that have not even been expanded in aqueous environments, because there will be condensation and things of this nature within these tunnels, as has been mentioned, at below boiling point and above boiling point.

Because of the fact that this is a very -- that the very nature of Yucca Mountain is very cavernous, it has a unique underground environment that has received little or no study whatsoever, and the fact that the welds that are going to be used on the cask, because they will have to be used as a part of its structure, that there has been time and time again concern because this

will be a manmade process that is subject to flaws due to the very fact they are individually done, that these have corrosion points in them that can enter from aqueous and

38

air and oxidation. None of this is being concerned in that they are calling for further time and study on this, and yet the time is already running out, and it makes me wonder, what is DOE going to do to further offer opportunities to study these -- to study these very important questions because they lead to degradation and will allow for release, will allow for a release of radiation.

Also, it has been noted that Alloy 22, that there are so many parts of it that are not understood fully, that they've been talking about such as Alloy 316, Alloy 690. If 22 has been considered the standard and has already been gone ahead for many years and all this research time and effort has been put into this, yet only now is it being talked about that it won't even satisfy the function that it's been offered to -- that this is going to be the standard for which all the waste is going to be deposited in there, and now it's being -- it's even been said in this report that Alloy 22 may not meet the

standards that you guys have set forth for this material and that you're talking about all these other materials, but yet there's been no offering as to what are these materials, what are their compositions and what, if any, study has been done about them.

And here we are in 2001 when the mandate is

39

going to be gone and it has to go to the President's desk and he's signing it, that there is no explanation as to what these materials are, what are their thresholds, what if, any effects, such localized environments, corrosion, aqueous environments have on them, and it just makes me wonder why only now is this being mentioned for review when it's -- basically it's coming down to where it's too late, and I was hoping maybe during the comment period later on when you guys are talking if there could be some explanation as to what these materials are and why is it they're being considered only now when for years there was time and ample study to do it. Why is it only being done now?

And those are just some of my concerns, and I wish to have them reflected for the record. Thank you.